



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/927,822

08/10/2001

Christian L. Kuiawa

18133-102

6244

30623

7590

07/28/2006

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY  
AND POPEO, P.C.  
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER  
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/927,822

Applicant(s)

KUIAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 2-18 have been examined.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. This action is responsive to Amendment D filed, 6/22/2006. Claims 2-18 are pending in this application. Claims 2-18 have been amended. This action is Final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al ("Anderson", US 5,961,604) in view of McIntyre et al ("McIntyre", US 6,299,538) in view of Richardson ("Richardson", US 6,271,845).

As per claim 2, Anderson teaches a system coupled to a plurality of uninterruptible power supply (UPS) devices, which are being monitored by the system, the system including a display, a method of monitoring diagnosed states of the devices comprising: displaying a monitoring icon with a normal indication if each operating characteristic, of the UPS devices being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in a normal state (Figure 7 item 220, OK); and displaying the monitoring icon with an abnormal indication if at least one of the UPS operating characteristics being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in an abnormal state (Figure 7 item 220, Alarm). Anderson does not distinctly teach an icon. However, McIntyre teaches an icon

reflecting the status (Column 15 line 40 – Column 16 line 2). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of status icons of McIntyre with the system of Anderson. Motivation to do so would have been to visually depict the problem by looking at the icon. Anderson-McIntyre fails to distinctly point out a single monitoring icon for a plurality of devices. However, Richardson teaches a single monitoring icon for a plurality of devices (Column 4 lines 20-46, Column 10 lines 44-60). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Richardson with the system of Anderson-McIntyre. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a simple way to monitor the health of a group of devices.

As per claim 3, Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson teaches the method further comprising: diagnosing the abnormal state of the at least one UPS device as one of multiple levels of abnormal states (McIntyre, Column 15 line 40 – Column 16 line 2); associating each level of abnormal state with a different abnormal indication (McIntyre, Column 15 line 40 – Column 16 line 2); and displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indication associated with the diagnosed level of abnormal state of the UPS device (McIntyre, Column 15 line 40 – Column 16 line 2).

Independent claims 10 and 17 are similar in scope to independent claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claims 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 4-9 and 12-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al ("Anderson", US 5,961,604) in view of McIntyre et al ("McIntyre", US 6,299,538) and view of Richardson ("Richardson", US 6,271,845) and further in view of Chin et al. ("Chin" US 6,456,306).

As per claim 4, Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson fails to teach prioritizing abnormal states. However, Chin teaches the method further comprising: prioritizing the multiple levels of the abnormal states; and displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indication associated with a first level of higher priority when a first UPS device of the UPS devices is at the first level of priority and a second UPS device of the UPS devices is at a second level of priority lower than the first level (Column 6, lines 46-64, Figure 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of a priority status of Chin with the system of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson. Motivation to do so would have been to detect the severity of a problem with just a glance.

As per claim 5, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 4, further comprising: opening a dialog window when the monitoring icon is selected (Chin, Column 6 lines 47-64) and displaying in the dialog window a list of at least a portion of the UPS devices being monitored and corresponding states of at least some of the UPS devices on the list (Chin, Fig.6).

As per claim 6, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 5, further comprising: receiving an input selecting a UPS

device from the list (Chin, col.6, lines 55-58), displaying a menu upon selection of a UPS device from the list, the menu comprising at least one UPS management function; receiving an input selecting a UPS management function from the menu; and causing the UPS management function to be performed on the selected UPS device (Chin, Column 8, lines 55-67; menu is only operable after selecting a device from the list).

As per claim 7, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 6, further comprising: opening a status window; and displaying in the status window at least one event associated with the state of a UPS device when the UPS device is selected from the list of UPS devices (Chin, Column 6, lines 55-64, Anderson Figure 7).

As per claim 8, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teach the method as recited in claim 7, further comprising: displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, section 870-ANALYZE icon); and displaying a power event analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when a power event analysis icon is selected (Anderson, Figure 7, item 222).

As per claim 9, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teach the method as recited in claim 8, further comprising: displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, section 870-ANALYZE icon and displaying a voltage analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when the voltage analysis icon is selected (Anderson, Figure 7, item 222).

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claims 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15-16 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, the method of Anderson-McIntyre-Richardson-Chin teach the system of claim 16 further comprising means for diagnosing the state of a UPS device operably coupled to the system (Anderson, Figure 7).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Pitaro  
Art Unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100